Ten Bears Environmental

MID ATLANTIC
117 Orchard Hill Ct.
Marvin, NC 28173
Tel: (704) 219-1070

DELAWARE
1080 S. Chapel St.
Newark, DE 19702
Tel: (302) 731-8633
Fax: (302) 731-8655

606 Federal Street
Milton, DE 19968
Tel: (302) 684-5080
Fax: (302) 684-5081

WEST COAST
41158 Rimfield Dr.
Palmdale, CA 93551-1211
Tel: (661) 435-5210

December 28, 2011

Parkowski, Guerke & Swayze, P.A.
Attn: Mr. F. Michael Parkowski, Esquire
116 West Water Street
Dover, DE 19904

RE: Environmental Evaluation of DNREC's Site Inspection Report
Procino Plating Facility (DE-0344)
901 South Market Street
Blades, Sussex County, Delaware
P.N. 11-1027.A

Mr. Parkowski:

Ten Bears Environmental, L.L.C. appreciates this opportunity to present our Environmental Evaluation of the Site Inspection performed by the State of Delaware's Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control (DNREC) at the Procino Plating Facility (DE-0344) located in Blades, Delaware. We performed this evaluation on behalf of Procino Plating, in order to evaluate the scope of DNREC's Site Inspection, the quantity and quality of data collected, the findings and conclusions reached by DNREC, and the recommendations for additional work made by DNREC in the Site Inspection Report (September, 2011) based upon them. Each of those topics is described further in the following sections of this evaluation.

Ten Bears Environmental (TBE) takes exception to some of the significant Findings and Conclusions reached by DNREC in their Site Inspection of the Procino Plating Facility. Although DNREC implemented a dense sampling program at the site with several layers of "worst-case" bias, the sampling data do not show a clear relationship between soil and groundwater quality at the Plating property compared to the water quality samples from nearby domestic wells. Although one onsite monitor well contained total chromium at a concentration above the Drinking Water standard, the site groundwater is not used for drinking water. And although domestic wells exist in the vicinity of the Procino Property, neither the groundwater elevations (flow direction) nor the water quality data from the actual sampling of the closest domestic wells indicated any impact from the Property in the 20 home wells closest to the Property, which are those most likely to show site impacts if any are present.

The lack of chromium speciation data to demonstrate that the onsite groundwater contains sufficient hexavalent chromium to pose a potential ingestion risk, the lack of groundwater receptors in the apparent downgradient (southerly) direction, and the absence of any organic or inorganic groundwater contaminants in the closest 20 domestic wells at concentrations potentially indicative of

adverse human health impacts linked to the Procino Plating site, suggests that DNREC's recommendations for the need for more extensive evaluation at the Property is not scientifically justified.

In order to address the data gaps identified above, we recommend the collection of the following pieces of information in order to better represent actual site conditions and quantify the potential for actual risk (as opposed to "worst case" potential risks)

- Request a lab analysis of Chromium species from the MW-6 sample (hold time 6 months) to quantify the proportion of hexavalent chromium versus trivalent chromium in the total chromium onsite sample. If present at a concentration near the EPA RSL, and pending confirmation of the groundwater flow direction (#2 below) toward groundwater receptors in that direction, further delineation of hexavalent chromium in the MW-6 vicinity may be warranted.
- Perform confirmatory re-measurement of depth-to-groundwater levels to verify the unexpected onsite groundwater flow direction (to the south rather than northwest towards the River).
- Re-sample zinc from domestic well Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) to establish a representative concentration should DNREC desire; this is not a risk-based issue.
- Re-sample total cyanide at the one domestic well at which a trace level concentration was reported.

These measures would provide a cost-effective means to address DNREC's concerns without (or prior to) implementing extensive additional sampling.

The following sections of his letter provide the support for the conclusions and recommendations made by Ten Bears Environmental in the above paragraphs.

DNREC SITE INSPECTION - DATA QUANTITY & QUALITY

Sample Density

The sampling program utilized by DNREC included the following data points:

- 13 soil borings were installed and 13 surface soil samples and 13 subsurface soil samples were collected on a 1.16-acre site;
- 6 groundwater Monitor Wells were installed on a 1.16-acre site.

In TBE's experience, the above-listed density of sample data collection at the Procino Plating Site is greater than typical for a property of this size (1.16 acres).

No Statistically-Derived Sampling Program

DNREC typically requires that the sufficiency of a proposed sampling program be documented by the statistical calculation of the number of sample points needed to determine overall site conditions at a specified level of confidence (typically 95%) using EPA-approved statistical software such as Visual Sample Plan or equivalent. However, DNREC did not provide that same evaluation to support the numbers or locations of their Site Inspection sample points. As a result, it is difficult for TBE to assess whether the data quality objectives of DNREC's Site Inspection were ever established,

or if they were met. The atypical density of data collected by DNREC for this SI raises cost/benefit concerns. The extraordinary sampling effort has not produced the results which perhaps were anticipated.

Biased Data Set

Twenty six samples of soil from the Procino Plating Site were collected by DNREC personnel and were submitted to DNREC SIRS' lab for screening analyses per standard HSCA procedures. On the basis of the screening results, DNREC SIRS chemist selected a subset of the soil samples to go to DNREC's Environmental Services Lab for confirmatory analyses of metals and organic compounds. "Screened soil samples identified as having elevated concentrations of contaminants for a particular chemical suite were chosen for confirmatory analysis"; in other words, the selection of samples to be sent for confirmatory lab analysis with full QA/QC was limited to those containing contaminants, was "biased high". Limiting the data to those having the highest concentrations of contaminants is another means of insuring a very conservative "worst case" outcome

Number of QA Samples

One soil field duplicate sample was collected to accompany the 26 soil samples for lab QA/QC; this is less than the 1 per 20 conventionally utilized for most EPA Statements of Work through EPAs Contract Lab Program. Nor did DNREC provide any assessment or description that the lab analyses met the requisite limits established for the QA parameters (precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, and comparability).

Laboratory Performance

Ten Bears is not certain of the qualifications of any of the labs used to analyze samples collected during the Procino Plating Site Inspection. Neither DNREC SIRS' lab nor DNREC's ESL lab are certified or EPA-approved as Contract Labs to perform Target Compound List or Target Analyte List analyses for Superfund. It seems rather unusual that the analysis of soil samples from a metals plating site would be determined using an XRF method to choose the samples for subsequent TAL analysis. However, even under this situation of further "high bias" (XRF methods tend to over-quantify metals concentrations), none of the "highest concentration" soil samples culled from the 26 samples from the Procino Plating Site analyzed by the outside lab contained a single metal at a concentration above EPA's Residential Screening Level. There is no indication, in either DNREC's screening data or in the outside lab data, of any release of metals from the Procino Plating processes to surface soil (13 samples) or to the soil from the capillary zone (13 samples) above the water table.

A similar situation exists for the analysis of the groundwater data. Ten Bears is not certain of the qualifications of any of the labs used to analyze samples collected during the Procino Plating Site Inspection. Neither DNREC's ESL lab nor Atlantic Coast Laboratories (performed the cyanide analysis) are certified or EPA-approved as Contract Labs to perform Target Compound List or Target Analyte List analyses of groundwater under the Superfund Program. TestAmerica Lab (performed the pesticide/PCB and cyanide analyses for the onsite Monitor Well groundwater samples) probably does meet USEPA CLP requirements and may have active certifications to perform such; however, none of the critical SI analyses were performed at TestAmerica lab with the exception of the lack of detection of cyanide in the site monitor well samples. The main function of DNREC's ESL lab is to perform routine water potability testing for the Division of Public Health. Further, Atlantic Coast labs detection of total cyanide in one of the domestic water samples was questioned by the DNREC Project Manager (a geologist); although a hand-written note states that the cyanide detection was verified, the author of the scrawl is not clearly identified, the verification process is not described, nor can Ten Bears attest to the adequacy or validity of that statement.

DNREC's SITE INSPECTION FINDINGS

Regulatory Standards used by DNREC to Compare to Site Data – SI Tables 2-10

DNREC's data tables 2-10 list obsolete concentrations, the Uniform Risk-Based Standards (URS) from state Guidance (***Remediation Standards Guidance Under the Delaware Hazardous Substance Cleanup Act,*** 1999) for comparison to site data. When issued in 1999, the URS's reflected EPA's soil and groundwater "Risk Based Concentrations (RBCs)" but over the intervening 12 years, the URS values have diverged from EPA's RBCs for many reasons. Accordingly, the DNREC URS values have been phased out as risk screening tools; the rationale is unclear for including these obsolete URS values on the SI data tables. Sample concentrations which exceed DNREC URS values on Tables in the Procino Plating SI Report have no relationship to current risk-based concentrations.

Per DNREC policy, the URS have been replaced as risk screening tools by EPA's risk-based concentrations issued annually by EPA Region 3, now called Regional Screening Levels (RSLs). These reference RSL values are also listed on the SI Tables 2-10. The RSLs reflect "screening" concentrations for individual contaminants that are an order of magnitude below (0.1 of) the cumulative site-wide risk level allowable under Delaware's HSCA Act (a $1x10^{-6}$ carcinogenic risk level and a non-cancer hazard index of 0.1 unit). As such, a soil or groundwater sample concentration at a value above the RSL, even at 10 times the RSL, does not directly indicate an unacceptable level of risk to any receptor, merely the potential for such to be further assessed by a quantitative site-wide risk assessment.

"Worst Case" versus Representative Cumulative Site Risk

According to ***Delaware Regulations Governing Hazardous Substance Cleanup*** (aka, the HSCA Regulations; Definitions and Section 9.0 Cleanup Levels), the assessment of risks posed by a site should represent "reasonable maximum exposure" conditions over the site. In other words, the risks posed by a site are not determined using the single highest concentration at the property, but should reflect overall conditions (i.e., a statistical evaluation) at the relevant exposure areas under current and future land uses at the site. In contrast to the specified RME conditions, DNREC used the maximum contaminant concentration detected in order to generate a "worst-case' scenario. TBE subsequently followed DNREC's lead using maximum detections to generate a biased situation of "worst case" risk in the following evaluation, although it should be noted that this approach is neither that conventionally used to determine representative cumulative site risks at a property or exposure area, nor is it permissible to do so according to state HSCA Regulations.

Onsite Soil Quality (SI Tables 2-5)

- Recall that the SI soil samples submitted to the lab (Tables 2 through 5) were a biased high subset from the DNREC SIRS lab screening analyses of all 26 site soil samples.
- Very few organic compounds were detected in the lab soil samples: 3 VOCs detected from the list of 50 analyzed; 0 SVOCs detected of 69 analyzed; 5 pesticides of 21 tested; and 0 PCB Aroclors of 7 tested.
- Pesticide compounds are not related to plating processes at the site. Pesticide compounds at low concentrations are typical in shallow soil samples.
- None of the organic contaminants were detected in either surface soil or subsurface soil at a concentration above the ***Screening RSL*** ($1x10^{-6}$ risk level) – see Tables 2, 3, and 4.

- No metals contaminants were detected in either surface soil or subsurface soil at concentrations above a Screening RSL – see Table 5. This is rather atypical for a metals plating property, and indicates good housekeeping and responsible stewardship.
- The indicated "high level" of iron (shaded cells on Table 5) reflects concentrations above DNREC URS values no longer in use. Iron concentrations in soil did not exceed EPA's RSLs for residential soil or for industrial soil.
- DNREC identified total chromium and nickel as potential site-related contaminants in onsite groundwater samples, and total cyanides and zinc as potential site-related contaminants in offsite domestic well groundwater samples. However, neither nickel nor cyanides were detected in onsite soil samples, nor were chromiun or zinc detected in site soil samples at concentrations above DNREC URS or EPA's risk-Screening Levels (see DNREC's SI Table 5). As such, no onsite source area is indicated by the soil data.

OnSite Soil Summary – Despite an atypically dense soil sampling program, bias in the collection of samples from "most likely to be contaminated" locations, and bias in the selection of the highest of those samples to be sent to the lab for analysis, none of the lab soil samples contained contaminants at concentrations above a screening RSL. As a result, no potential sources of contamination are indicated to be present in the site soil, thus no additional investigation or further delineation of soil quality is warranted on the basis of the data collected.

Onsite Groundwater Quality (SI Tables 6-9)

- Recall the dense groundwater sampling program - 6 monitor wells were installed by DNREC on a 1.16-acre property.
- Very few organic compounds were detected in the lab groundwater samples using low detection limits of 0.5 ug/L. 1 VOC was detected in 3 of the 6 samples (2 of which were very low concentrations below the lab detection limit) from the list of 50 VOC compounds analyzed; 1 SVOC detected (of 69 compounds analyzed) in 1 of 6 onsite groundwater samples; low levels of pesticides (1 compound in 2 wells, 5 compounds in 1 well) of 21 pesticides tested (none are onsite soil contaminants); and 0 PCB Aroclors of 7 tested.
- The pesticide Dieldrin was detected above RSLs in 3 groundwater samples, two of which were from wells located generally upgradient (MW-1 and MW-3) of the site, indicating a background condition.
- No organic compounds indicative of Plating solvents, cleaners, other processes or fuels were detected in either site soils (see Tables 2, 3, and 4) or in onsite groundwater samples (Tables 5, 6, 7) at levels above EPA ***Screening Levels*** for residential soil or Tap Water, respectively.
- Only 1 of 6 onsite Monitor well samples (MW-6) contained one (1) potentially site-related metal (total chromium) at a concentration of possible concern (i.e., above an EPA ***Screening Level***). Nickel concentration did not exceed the RSL. The total chromium detection is further described in the following.

  Total Chromium Discussion

  1. Total chromium was detected in 1 of the 6 onsite monitor wells (MW-6) and was not detected in the other 5 of 6 groundwater samples.
  2. The concentration of total chromium detected (959 ug/L dissolved and 1030 ug/L total) is above EPA's Primary Drinking Water Standard (the MCL) for total chromium, which is 100 ug/L. **The MCL is not a risk-based concentration**. Because the MW-6 site

groundwater is not used for Drinking Water, the exceedance of the MCL is not necessarily indicative that groundwater quality poses any risk.

3. EPA Region 3 ***Regional Screening Level Summary Table (June 2011)*** does not provide a Screening Level (reflecting the $1x10^{-6}$ risk) for total chromium in Tap Water.
4. Total chromium is the sum of the two most common forms of chromium: (1) the most common is the naturally occurring trivalent chromium (Cr III) and (2) a less common form is the usually man-made hexavalent form (Cr VI).
5. The EPA MCL regulates the concentration of total Cr (the sum of CrIII + CrVI) in Drinking Water because the analysis of total Cr is the common drinking water analysis. The MCL for total Cr is 100 ug/L, which provides a margin of safety regarding the usually unknown ratio of the more harmful (probable human carcinogen) CrVI as compared to that of the more prevalent noncancerous CrIII. http://water.epa.gov/drink/contaminants/basicinformation/chromium.cfm
6. EPA Region 3 does not provide a Regional Screening Level (reflecting the $1x10^{-6}$ risk) for total chromium in Tap Water. The Tap Water RSL for trivalent chromium (Cr III) is 55,000 ug/L. The Tap Water RSL for hexavalent chromium (Cr VI) in 0.043 ug/L. The maximum onsite well contained 1,030 ug/L of total chromium while 5 of 6 site wells were non-detect (less than the detection limit of 5 ug/L) for total chromium. The geometric mean of the site monitor well data for total Cr is 170 ug/L (see ProUCL printout, attached).
7. Without lab analysis of the concentration of each form of chromium (a.k.a. "speciation"), the proportion of CrIII to CrIV is not known for the site groundwater at the MW-6 area.
8. Using the online Risk Calculator tool on EPAs Risk Assessment Information System (RAIS; http://rais.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/prg/RISK_search?select=chem) the site concentration of 1,030 ug/L as Total Chromium or as CrIII has **no calculated risk** (either carcinogenic or noncancer Hazard Index) for residential Tap Water in the "Total Risk" column (printout attached).
9. Under the worst possible case assumption that all 1,030 ug/L of the total Cr is hexavalent CrIV, the RAIS calculated **residential** risk for lifetime (70 years) cancer risk using MW-6 onsite groundwater as Drinking Water yields a risk of 3.29E-02. This exposure pathway is not present under current site conditions, nor is it likely under future site uses. **Recommend additional analysis of Chromium species in MW-6 to evaluate distribution of CrIII to CrVI.**
10. Because the Procino Plating Site is on public water, no consumption of site groundwater is occurring presently or likely to occur in the future. As a result, the ingestion of site groundwater is an "incomplete exposure pathway".

Groundwater Flow Direction Evaluation

1. DNREC reported a south-southwesterly direction of groundwater flow in the SI Report shown on their Figure 14. These contour lines vary in width and are unconventionally curvy. The northerly curve in the contour lines along the western site margin is not based on any well data points; this curve is what supports DNREC's interpretation of flow to the southwest rather than due south.
2. TBE replotted the groundwater elevation data to smooth out the uneven distances between contour lines and to straighten the curvy lines per conventional procedures. Properly interpolating distances between existing well data points results in a northern readjustment of the 91.50 line, the 91.60 line, and the 91.70 line, which adjust the direction of groundwater flow more to the south than to the southwest.

3. Both the southern and the southwestern groundwater flow direction are counterintuitive due to the presence of a regional surface water feature (the Nanticoke River) to the northwest of the property. The conventional interpretation of shallow local groundwater flow would be towards the River (to the northwest). **Recommend confirmatory re-measurement of depth- to-groundwater levels to verify interpretations of groundwater flow direction.**
4. If DNREC Figure 16 is correct and shallow site groundwater flows to the southwest, then logically the total Cr detected at 1,030 ug/L at MW-6 should have been at least detected in the sample from MW-1 which lies SW of MW-6; however, the MW-1 sample did not contain detectable concentration of total Cr (above 5 ug/L). Nor did any of the residential wells located farther to the southwest contain total chromium at a detectable concentration (above 5 ug/L). Thus the groundwater quality data support the interpretation that the direction of shallow groundwater flow is southerly, **not southwesterly towards MW-1 and then towards the residences.**
5. Site gradient is 0.002 ft/ft – relatively flat, as is topography.

OnSite Groundwater Summary

The onsite groundwater data from DNREC's dense network (they installed 6 onsite monitor wells) does not show any onsite groundwater-related risks because:

- No organic or inorganic site-related COCs present at concentrations above the EPA RSL (0.1 of any individual risk levels) in the onsite groundwater from 5 of 6 monitor wells;
- Although 1 organic compound (the pesticide Dieldrin) was detected above RSLs in 3 groundwater samples, it is not an onsite soil contaminant, and its presence in two of the upgradient wells (MW-1 and MW-3) indicates a background condition.
- Only 1 metal (total chromium) was detected at this metals plating site in 1 monitor well (MW-6) at a concentration 10 times the MCL (not a Risk-based Standard) in the onsite groundwater from 1 of 6 wells;
- No unacceptable risk was calculated from the residential ingestion of onsite MW-6 groundwater **unless** all total chromium is the least common, hexavalent species; and
- The provision of public water at the property renders the onsite consumption of site groundwater to be an incomplete exposure pathway.

Nor does the onsite groundwater data indicate the potential for off-site groundwater-related risks because:

- DNRECs interpreted southwestern groundwater flow direction towards the residential area is not supported by recontouring of the site groundwater elevation data;
- The southwestern groundwater flow direction suggested by DNREC is not supported by the groundwater quality data; total chromium was **not present at a concentration near the MCL (100 ug/L) or indicative of site impact** in any or the 20 residential well samples although present at 1,030 ug/L in the most southern of the site monitor wells;
- The residential wells most likely to contain site-related groundwater constituents, those closest to the Procino Plating property (site #7, 8, 9, 18, and 19 on DNREC Figure 13), were tested by DNREC and found not to contain COCs at concentrations above Screening Levels indicative of potential human health risks; and
- Total cyanide (detected in 1 domestic well sample at a concentration below the MCL and below the Tap Water Screening Level) was **not detected** in the onsite soil samples or

onsite monitor well samples, therefore there is no attribution to the subject property as a potential source of total cyanide.

Offsite Residential Well Water Quality (Table 10)

- The reported concentrations of barium and manganese exceeded the Secondary MCL in 4 and 7 well samples, respectively. The SMCL is an aesthetic non-enforceable standard. Both metals are common background metals in groundwater in Sussex County.
- The detected concentrations of barium and manganese were well below EPAs risk-based Tap Water RSL (the 1 x 10^{-6} or HI of 1.0 unit).
- Neither Ba or Mn was present at similar concentrations in the onsite monitor well samples, showing no interconnection to site groundwater.
- One of the same residential well samples also contained zinc at a level above the SMCL but **not above** the risk-based Screening Level: furthermore, the elevated zinc detection was mush higher than the first zinc measurement from that same residence. Although Zn concentrations do not indicate human health risks, **suggest resampling to verify zinc concentration.**
- Note that the total chromium (reported at 1,030 ug/L in site monitor well MW-6) was **not** detected at an elevated concentration in the 20 residential Drinking Water well samples. Reported total Cr concentrations were 3.8 ug/L or less except for 1 sample which was 24.2 ug/L; all were well below the MCL of 100 ug/L. Again, no connectivity to the site is indicated.
- Total cyanide was detected at 0.1 of the MCL in 1 domestic water sample. Total Cyanide was not detected on the Procino Plating site in either soil samples or site monitor well samples, therefore there is no data attributing the Plating property as a source of cyanide.

TEN BEARS CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Ten Bears Environmental respectfully disagrees with the findings and conclusions reached by the State of Delaware's DNREC in their Site Inspection of the Procino Plating Facility. Although a dense sampling program occurred at the site with several layers of "worst-case" bias, the collected sample data do not show a clear relationship between soil and groundwater quality at the Plating property and the water quality samples from nearby domestic wells. Although one onsite monitor well contained total chromium at a concentration above the Drinking Water standard, the site groundwater is not used for drinking water. And although domestic wells exist in the vicinity of the Procino Property, neither the groundwater flow direction nor the domestic well quality data indicated any impact from the Property to any of the 20 home wells closest to the Property, which are those most likely to show site impacts if any are present.

Given the absence of chromium speciation data to demonstrate that the onsite groundwater contains sufficient hexavalent chromium to pose a potential ingestion risk, given the lack of groundwater receptors in the apparent downgradient (southerly) direction, and given the absence of any organic or inorganic groundwater contaminants in the closest 20 domestic wells at concentrations indicative of potential adverse human health impacts, or suggestive of a source at the Procino Plating site, we also respectfully disagree with DNREC's recommendations for extensive evaluation at the Property.

In order to address the data gaps identified above to better represent actual site conditions and quantify the potential for actual risk (as opposed to "worst case" potential risks), we recommend the collection of the following pieces of information:

1. Request lab chromium species analysis from the MW-6 sample (hold time 6 months) to quantify the proportion of hexavalent chromium to trivalent chromium in the total chromium onsite samples. If present at a concentration near the EPA RSL, and pending confirmation of the groundwater flow direction and the presence of groundwater receptors in that direction, further delineation of hexavalent chromium in the MW-6 vicinity may be warranted.
2. Perform confirmatory re-measurement of depth- to-groundwater levels to verify the unexpected groundwater flow direction (to the south vs. northwest towards the River).
3. Re-sample zinc from domestic well Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) to establish a representative concentration should DNREC desire; this is not a risk-based issue.
4. Re-sample to the cyanide at the one domestic well at which a trace level concentration was detected.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service to you and Procino Plating. If you have any questions concerning this evaluation, or if you would like further information, please contact us.

Sincerely,

TEN BEARS ENVIRONMENTAL, L.L.C.

Ex. 4 CBI
Senior Geologist

Ex. 4 CBI
Manager

Enclosures:

Risk calculator printouts from online Risk Assessment Information System:

Residential Risk for Tap Water: Using maximum detected concentrations of total chromium (from MW-6), total cyanide (from Home Well #8), and zinc (from Home Well #1).

Residential Risk for Tap Water: Comparing risk from maximum detected total Cr if all 1,030 ug/L is CrIII vs if all is CrIV.

Indoor Worker Risk for Tap Water: Using maximum detected total Cr.

ProUCL calculation of total chromium statistics from onsite monitor wells;

Figure 13 revised: Groundwater Elevations and Flow Direction in the Shallow Zone from onsite monitor well data.

LAW OFFICES
PARKOWSKI, GUERKE & SWAYZE
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
116 WEST WATER STREET
P.O. BOX 598
DOVER, DELAWARE 19903
302-678-3262
FAX: 302-678-9415
www.pgslegal.com

F. MICHAEL PARKOWSKI
I. BARRY GUERKE
DAVID S. SWAYZE
CLAY T. JESTER
JEREMY W. HOMER (also PA)
JOHN C. ANDRADE
MARK F. DUNKLE (also GA & PA)
WILLIAM A. DENMAN
MICHAEL W. ARRINGTON (also MD & DC)
CHRISTINE P. SCHILTZ
MICHAEL W. TEICHMAN
KASHIF I. CHOWDHRY (also PA)

WILMINGTON OFFICE
800 KING STREET, SUITE 203
WILMINGTON, DE 19801
302-654-3300
FAX: 302-654-3033

GEORGETOWN OFFICE
16 S. FRONT STREET
GEORGETOWN, DE 19947
302-855-9090

January 3, 2012

Mr. Timothy T. Ratsep
DNREC-SIRS Program Administrator
391 Lukens Drive
New Castle, DE 19720-2774

RE: Voluntary Cleanup Program Request – Procino Plating, Inc. (DE-0344)

Dear Mr. Ratsep:

Your letter dated December 8, 2011 directed to Patrick and Rita Procino regarding the above referenced matter has been referred to us for response. We much appreciate the opportunity extended by the Department to participate in the Voluntary Cleanup Program and you should consider this letter notification pursuant to Subsection 13.2(1)(e) of the regulations as the willingness of Procino Plating, Inc. to proceed with negotiations as outlined in your letter.

As an initial matter we would like to emphasize that Procino Plating, Inc. is a small company with limited resources employing ten individuals, three of whom are family members. The operations of the company have been reduced significantly to the extent that the company no longer operates a wastewater pretreatment system and the amount of hazardous waste generated is one to three barrels per year. Through the negotiation process we hope it will be possible to obtain the Department's cooperation in formulating a cost effective work plan to satisfy regulatory requirements.

As you know during the Department's recent Site Inspection of the property Ten Bears Environmental was involved on behalf of Procino Plating in overseeing the extensive soil and groundwater sampling which was conducted. As requested in your letter we wish to advise that Ten Bears Environmental will continue as Procino Plating's consultant during the VCP process. We also wish to advise that a laboratory has not been selected at this point, however, the laboratory which is used will be qualified to perform HSCA analysis.

As a result of the cooperation extended by the Department in providing a copy of the Site Inspection Report to our client we were able to have an Environmental Evaluation of the Inspection Report prepared by Ten Bears Environmental. A copy of the evaluation is enclosed. We believe some of the technical questions raised may have significant impact on limiting the

scope and cost of remedial activities. Specifically, at this early stage we would like to draw your attention to the following:

1. Total chromium concentrations at one sampling well onsite may not be a valid indication of risk since the difference in level of risk between tri-valent chromium (noncancerous) and hexa-valent chromium (carcinogen) concentrations is significant. There is a need for speciation and consideration of other factors before any extensive offsite pathway exposure analysis is undertaken.

2. The detection of pesticide concentrations above screening levels appears to be an anomaly and needs review due to the fact that pesticides have not been used in the plating operations which occurred at the site.

3. The direction of groundwater flow as characterized in the Department's Site Inspection Report requires review. Based on speculation drinking water well data contained in the Department's Report suggests a linkage to the site of below standard zinc concentrations and a barely detectable cyanide concentration at one offsite location, when in fact the extensive sampling conducted at the site revealed no corresponding concentrations. The groundwater data in the report suggests that the referenced drinking water wells are in fact located side gradient to the site, and are some distance away.

As we proceed in the VCP process we will be addressing the above and other questions in an effort to produce an acceptable work plan leading to site closure. At this time we anticipate providing a markup of the VCP Agreement and a draft work plan in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

F. Michael Parkowski

F. MICHAEL PARKOWSKI

FMP/ang
cc: Procino Plating, Inc.
Ten Bears Environmental
Marjorie Crofts, Director
Qazi Salahuddin, Program Manager I
John G. Cargill, Project Manager
Robert S. Kuehl, Deputy Attorney General
Robert Newsome, Public Information Officer